

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Amendments to the Claims**

Claim 13 has been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

In addition, claim 14 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection**

Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kenichi et al. (U.S. JP 2002-215826) and Perlman et al. (U.S. 6,230,266). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claim 13 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 13 recites a method of operating a communication system comprising an Nth authentication apparatus, an (N+1)th authentication apparatus, and an (N+1)th download server. In addition, claim 13 recites that an Nth CA information issue unit (of the Nth authentication apparatus) issues Nth CA information including (i) an Nth CA certificate indicating that the Nth server certificate is valid and (ii) an (N+1)th address indicating a location of the (N+1)th download server on the communication network. Moreover, claim 13 recites starting up the (N+1)th authentication apparatus and the (N+1)th download server, such that the

(N+1)th download server outputs (N+1)th CA information to the communication apparatus that is the client apparatus that receives the service from the application server.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Kenichi for teaching the above-identified distinguishing features, as recited in claim 13. However, Kenichi fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features, as recited in amended independent claim 13.

Rather, Kenichi teaches that a certificate 101 includes (i) an end date of validity 401 of the certificate 101, and (ii) certificate authority address information 402 (i.e., the address of the certificate authority that records (i) and (ii) onto the certificate 101) (see paragraph [0011] and Fig. 4). Furthermore, Kenichi teaches that when there are two certificate issuing authorities, certificate authority 801 of server 800 issues certificate 804 to client computer 100 and that certificate authority 803 of server 802 issues certificate 805 to client computer 100, such that the certificate 804 identifies the address of certificate authority 801 and certificate 805 identifies the address of certificate authority 803 (see paragraph [0019] stating “*when there are two or more certificate authorities, the certificate after updating can be received from each certificate authority in the same procedure as the case of the singular number of certificate authorities*”, paragraph [0011], ands Figs. 4 and 8).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Kenichi teaches that the certificate 804 includes and an address of certificate authority 801 that recorded the information into the certificate 804, and that the certificate 805 includes an address of certificate authority 803 that recorded the information into the certificate 805, but fails to disclose or suggest issuing Nth CA information that includes an Nth CA certificate indicating that the Nth server certificate is valid

and includes an (N+1)th address indicating a location of the (N+1)th download server on the communication network, as required by claim 13.

In other words, Kenichi teaches that the issued certificate is issued to the client computer 100 and identifies the certificate authority that issued the certificate, but fails to disclose or suggest that the issued Nth CA certificate that is issued by Nth CA issue unit identifies the address of the (N+1)th download server, as required by claim 13.

Additionally, after reviewing the present rejection, it is clear that the rejection equates the client computer 100 (see Fig. 8) of Kenichi with the (N+1)th download server, as recited in claim 13 (see, page 6 of the Office Action). However, Applicants disagree with such an assertion for the following reasons.

In view of the above, Kenichi clearly teaches that the certificate is issued from the certificate authority to the client computer 100 and that the certificate identifies the address of the certificate authority. On the other hand, claim 13 requires that that the Nth CA issue unit issues the Nth CA certificate that identifies the address of the (N+1)th download server that outputs (N+1)th CA information to the communication apparatus that is the client apparatus that receives the service from the application server.

In other words, Kenichi requires that the certificate is issued to the client computer 100 and identifies the issuing authority, but fails to disclose or suggest that the CA certificate identifies the address of the download server that outputs (N+1)th CA information to the client apparatus, as required by claim 13.

Applicants also submit that Perlman fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features, as recited in claim 13, that are lacking from Kenichi.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 13 and claims 14 and 15 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Kenichi and Perlman.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kenichi and/or Perlman or elsewhere in the prior art of record that would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kenichi and/or Perlman to obtain the invention of independent claim 13. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 13 and claims 14 and 15 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

*The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or to credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 23-0975, with the EXCEPTION of deficiencies in fees for multiple dependent claims in new applications.*

Respectfully submitted,

Junji YOSHIDA et al.  
/Andrew L. Dunlap/  
By: 2009.06.30 14:06:43 -04'00'  
Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
June 30, 2009